1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS	
2	EASTERN DIVISION	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) Docket No. 16 CR 109	
4	Plaintiff,) Chicago, Illinois) November 17, 2020	
5	v.) 10:42 A.M.	
6	RALPH GARCIA,	
7	Defendant.)	
8	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS - SENTENCING HEARING	
9	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT M. DOW, JR.	
10	APPEARANCES:	
11		
12	For the Plaintiff: HON. JOHN R. LAUSCH, JR. UNITED STATES ATTORNEY	
13	BY: MR. TIMOTHY J. STURINO ASSISTANT UNITED STATES ATTORNEY	
14	219 South Dearborn Street, Fifth F Chicago, Illinois 60604	loor
15	tim.sturino@usdoj.gov	
16		
17	For the Defendant: LAW OFFICES OF JOHN LEGUTKI BY: MR. JOHN C. LEGUTKI	
18	53 West Jackson Boulevard, Suite 9: Chicago, Illinois 60604	20
19	jlegutki@sbcglobal.net	
20	Also Present: MS. KELLY KWONG United States Probation Officer	
21	Court Reporter: KRISTIN M. ASHENHURST, CSR, RDR, C	RR
22	Official Court Reporter 219 S. Dearborn Street, Room 2304-	A
23	Chicago, IL 60604 (312) 818-6549	
24	kristin_ashenhurst@ilnd.uscourts.g	ΟV
25		

(The following proceedings were had via video.) 1 2 THE CLERK: 16-CR-109-1, United States of America 3 versus Ralph Garcia, and this is for sentencing. 4 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. So let me just make 5 sure Kris is still there. Kris, are you still there? 6 THE COURT REPORTER: I am. Thank you. 7 THE COURT: Okay. Great. So I can take attendance off my video here. I have Mr. Sturino here for the government. 8 9 MR. STURINO: Good morning, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: Good morning. You're coming in loud and 11 clear. Beautiful. 12 Mr. Legutki is here for the defendant. Mr. Legutki, 13 good morning. 14 MR. LEGUTKI: Good morning, sir. How are you today? 15 THE COURT: I am well. Thank you very much. Thank 16 you for your patience. 17 Ms. Kwong is here. She's stepping in here. 18 Mr. McKechnie is retired apparently, so we'll wish him well on 19 the record and express our jealousy, but we'll also thank 20 Ms. Kwong for stepping in. Good morning. 21 PROBATION OFFICER KWONG: Good morning. 22 THE COURT: And, Mr. Garcia, good morning. Can you 23 hear us okay? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I can, your Honor. THE COURT: We can hear you okay as well, so thank you 25

```
for your patience as well, sir.
 1
 2
               Okay. Well, good morning, everybody. Is the
 3
      government ready to proceed today?
               MR. STURINO: Yes, your Honor, we are.
 4
               THE COURT: Okay. And defense is ready to proceed as
 5
 6
     well?
 7
               MR. LEGUTKI: Yes, sir. Thank you.
               THE COURT: Okay. Very well. Carolyn, can you please
 8
 9
      swear in Mr. Garcia?
10
               THE CLERK: Sure. Mr. Garcia, can you please raise
11
      your right hand?
12
          (Defendant sworn.)
               THE COURT: Thank you, Carolyn. Mr. Garcia, good
13
14
      morning, again. And are you ready to proceed with sentencing
15
      today, sir?
16
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I am.
17
               THE COURT: Okay. Great. Thank you.
18
              Well, I want to start -- I want to thank Mr. McKechnie
19
      in absentia for preparing the PSR. And, counsel, I think you
20
      both have received a copy of Mr. McKechnie's recommendations;
21
      is that right?
22
               MR. STURINO: Yes, your Honor.
23
               MR. LEGUTKI: Yes, sir.
24
               THE COURT: Okay. Very good. I also want to thank
25
      counsel for the sentencing memoranda. And I know there were
```

some letters. Mr. Garcia, your mom wrote me a really nice letter. I got a lot of nice letters from your nieces and nephews. And yesterday Mr. Legutki filed your letter. So I thank you guys for all of that. You've got a very nice family. And I appreciate Mr. Legutki and Mr. Garcia, both of you, I'm sure, did a lot of legwork to get those letters on the docket, so thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: I think Mr. McKechnie gave me the honor of attaching the entire trial transcript to the PSR. I won't say I read every word of it, but I did go back and read my ruling at the end, so that's what I have. Is there anything that I'm missing? Government, is that everything I am supposed to have from your perspective, Mr. Sturino?

MR. STURINO: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And, Mr. Legutki, is that everything that the defense wanted me to have to review as well?

MR. LEGUTKI: Yes, sir. Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Wonderful. Thank you.

So let's start with the PSR then. Mr. Legutki, did you have a chance to review it with Mr. Garcia?

MR. LEGUTKI: Yes, sir. Mr. Garcia did receive his PSR, as well as the disclosure of the sentencing recommendation. Obviously because of the COVID restrictions that we have experienced over the last several months,

Mr. Garcia and my communication has been limited to audio, telephonic and some video communication. But I -- we have the -- both of those documents, and as well as the statement that Mr. Garcia produced. We discussed that. I will just note -- and I will get into it later. When Ralph and I spoke, I think the day before yesterday, there was a slight change to what I initially gave Ralph, and I incorporated some changes when I submitted it to the Court, so, yes, we have had an opportunity to review those documents.

THE COURT: Okay. Great. And I know you have a -- you articulated in your memorandum an objection on the acceptance of responsibility. Did you have any other objections, comments, or corrections. There were a few objections to the conditions of supervision, which we'll go over, too. Anything else besides those?

MR. LEGUTKI: No, sir. I think -- I tried to be inclusive, but concise, in my sentencing memorandum.

THE COURT: Okay. And I do appreciate that. And we'll go over both the acceptance of responsibility point, as well as the objections to the conditions of supervision in a couple of minutes here, but I just wanted to see if you had any other objections, comments, or corrections.

MR. LEGUTKI: That is it, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Garcia, I know Mr. Legutki told us you have had a chance to go over the PSR on the video and

also on the phone with him. Did you have any objections, comments, or corrections, in addition to the ones that he has raised in the sentencing memorandum?

THE DEFENDANT: No, not at this time, no.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Thank you. And
Mr. Sturino, does the government have any objections, comments,
or corrections to the PSR?

MR. STURINO: No, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. So why don't we start, then, with acceptance of responsibility point. And I will tell you my own take on it is that it's kind of a partial-credit situation. I read what you all said in the memoranda, and I think Mr. Garcia deserves some credit for not contesting the factual basis of offense of conviction. His argument was really a legal one and it was based on a defense of entrapment, and I explained in my memorandum the reason I didn't think it was successful legally, but I do think -- so I think as a -- first of all, because he went to trial, he wouldn't be eligible for the third point anyway, so what we're talking about is two points. And my take on it is, I don't think when you contest the facts on the basis of shifting the blame from yourself to the informant, that you get full credit, so I don't think I can give him the two points under the guidelines. you know, he certainly simplified matters considerably by not contesting the factual basis. The trial was probably one-fifth

of the trial it would have been if we had to put every witness on, and so I'm going to give him substantial partial credit, like my old calculus professor used do when my answers weren't quite right, but I was on the right track at least. My professor was very generous with partial credit, and I will be as well because I think Mr. Garcia got a considerable distance toward where you have to be to get the two points.

Now, at the end of the day, the guidelines are really long in this case. I don't think I will be inclined to give a guideline sentence because of the length of the guidelines and Mr. Garcia's age. And, you know, what he pointed out in his letters is also -- I mean, his criminal history is really long, serious. It's one of the longer and more serious ones I have seen. But when he was -- his last trip to custody, when he came out, he did some things that should have put him in good shape to carry on, and unfortunately he got caught back up in drugs and guns. I guess it's a long-winded way of saying the partial credit and my disinclination to give him a sentence of 292 months is going to narrow down to his benefit in the end on this, but I don't think I can give him the two points as a technical guideline matter.

Is there anything else the government would like to say on this issue just to create a full record?

MR. STURINO: No, your Honor. We laid out our arguments in our sentencing memo. I understand your Honor's

ruling, so I have nothing more to add.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Legutki, anything more you wanted to add to the record?

MR. LEGUTKI: Your Honor, you touched upon one thing that I was going to discuss a little bit later, but now there is a nice way to segue way, certainly since we have the audio and visual, who knows what's going to happen in two minutes with that, so allow me to get that in.

This case has gone on for a long time. I have had an opportunity, probably unlike any other federal defender case, to get to know Mr. Garcia. I've had many, many discussions with him in person and in video, telephonically. And one of the things he added, just the other night -- or the other day when I spoke with him, and he wanted it included in his statement and I did include it to the Court, but maybe not in the version that Ralph has. When I was talking to him, he said, "John, you know, when I got out, I really did want to do things differently. And I had an opportunity to get a job driving a truck going out of state. Going out of state would have been a game changer for me. I would have gotten out of the neighborhood, gotten away from people. He did mention -he did not mention the CI by name, but I'm sure there's others as well. But because he was on parole, he was unable to leave the state. He was unable to get that job. So that was just an important consideration that Ralph wanted me to convey to you.

And when I last spoke with Ralph in writing, getting things back and forth, they kind of got cut off, but Ralph asked me to stress that to the Court and asked you to make that part of your consideration, please.

THE COURT: And when he was in state custody previously; is that right?

MR. LEGUTKI: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: And that's, in a way, too bad, because the fact is if you were in federal custody or federal supervision, I have signed off on people getting a long-haul trucking job when they're on supervised release because it's actually a good job. It pays really well and, you know, the trucks and the cows and whatever you're hauling in the back don't care about your record, and a lot of employers don't either. It's a shame, actually, that you weren't in federal supervision because we would have signed off on that.

And I've said to many people over the year, you know, I know where you are from, Mr. Garcia, much better than I know most defendants because you don't live too far from me. But when I have defendants who come in and they have grown up their entire life in Englewood. And I say, "Do you know what the unemployment rate is in Englewood for African-American men with felony convictions? It's really high." And then I say to them, "Do you know what the unemployment rate is in Iowa?" And this is pre-pandemic. It was almost zero. And there were lots

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of really good jobs. They're hard jobs. Working in a meat-packing plant is a hard job, but they pay very well. cost of living in Iowa is a fraction of what it is in Chicago. The public schools are excellent. And I've had a few people take me up on that and they've moved. I had one guy out on pretrial release, and he wanted to get a job in Iowa, and by the time his case came up for a plea, it was about a year and a half in. He had a good job that paid well. His wife had a job teaching in Iowa. They wanted to stay in Iowa. And I cut his sentence in half because he proved to me that he could do it. His guidelines were like three years and I gave him a year and a half because he proved to me that he was on the right track. And, unfortunately, the state system isn't as good as the federal system in flexibility, so I hear the argument and I averred to it myself because I understand it.

The balance against that is everything I heard at the trial. And everything I heard at the trial was -- it's someone who really still knew where all of the drugs were and all of the different kind of drugs you could get. And where all of the guns were and how you could get all of the guns, too. that's the balance here. You have to take the bitter with the sweet at sentencing. I am well aware of the argument you just made, Mr. Legutki, and I referenced myself five minutes ago.

And, you know, if I had to rank the defendants who come in in terms of their demeanor in the courtroom and how

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

pleasant they were to deal with, Mr. Garcia would be near the He's actually -- you know, I have enjoyed him. There's a lot of defendants I don't enjoy because they're sullen and they feel sorry for themselves and they're bitter. And it's easy to get bitter after you've been in the system as many times as Mr. Garcia has, and he's not. He doesn't look bitter. He doesn't sound bitter. I actually have enjoyed having him. Ι think there's something there and I'm really rooting for him. And this time when you come out, you'll be on federal supervised release, and we'll work with you in a way that the state court doesn't really have the ability to work with you, but we will keep working with you. We don't give up on people who don't give up on themselves. And that's what I can tell, Mr. Garcia, you haven't given up on yourself, and your mother hasn't given up on you either.

Thanks, Mr. Legutki. On the PSR I think we 0kay. have covered all of the ground, and on the guidelines, I am going to end up accepting the guideline calculation, but I am going to give substantial partial credit for the way the case has unfolded in the end and the fact that Mr. Garcia did basically admit to all of the factual basis of the offense, and it was just a legal question that we had to sort out at the trial.

So let me turn this over to the lawyers, then, Mr. Garcia, if that's okay. I'll let the lawyers have their

say, and then when they're all done, I will let you have your say. Okay?

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Legutki, I'll give you the

first and last word, so you can start out and then Mr. Sturino

can say the government's piece, and then if he says anything

that offends you, you can turn around and come back on him.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

0kay?

Mr. Garcia from the first day has been a straight

MR. LEGUTKI: Thank you. I doubt Mr. Sturino would say anything offensive. Throughout this ordeal he has been courteous and professional just to the nth degree, and the same goes for Mr. Vandenberg.

Your Honor, your Honor touched upon something that it's really the -- a lot of times I don't go into because it's personal, almost nonobjective standard, but it's my relationship with Mr. Garcia. You can see from the picture, he is in one of those holding rooms. Your Honor, I don't know if you've ever been in a holding room with a defendant. They lock the door behind you and the guards walk down the hallway. It can be a very difficult experience. I'm 6'2" and about 210 pounds, and that's a little bit of a lie in my weight, but I'm a big guy. There are many times I have felt threatened -- you can't show it, of course. There is a lot of menacing, a lot of difficulty.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

shooter. What you see is very straight and honest and forthcoming. What you see in court is just a continuation of his overall demeanor. It's not an act, your Honor. Ralph. he is -- to use common language, he knew the jig was up, but there were certain circumstances he wanted to bring forward to the Court, and there was never a dispute as to anything else. just what you said, your Honor, that is Mr. Garcia and has been from the beginning of the minute one, the minute I met him. Ι never felt threatened by him. He was never menacing or accusatory. He was very businesslike and gracious, and that is his demeanor.

Your Honor, the dialogue today I think is unique to the circumstance, and it really should be. And the circumstances where we find Ralph with his age and the 15-year mandatory minimum as to Count Four.

If the circumstances were different, and what I mean by that is Mr. Garcia's advanced age, it might be a different presentation to the Court. But I think unless and until Congress revests the sentencing discretion where it belongs, with the trial court, we are stuck with the 15-year mandatory minimum.

I looked at a lot of cases, spoke with a lot of my colleagues about the mandatory minimum, how we could approach it? Again, unless Congress revests the Court with the sentencing discretion where it belongs, we're stuck with it.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

That said, 15 years is a long time. It's a long time for anyone under any circumstances, but I think it's made harsher given the fact that Mr. Garcia is going to be spending 15 years in prison. It's made harsher and more difficult, more dangerous, given his age.

3553(a) says we should impose -- the Court should impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary. Your Honor, I ask this Court to please consider that the 15 years, it is more than sufficient. It is -- it gets to the heart of what an appropriate sentence is.

As I pointed out in my sentencing memorandum, Mr. Garcia is going to be over 70 years old when he gets out. There's going to be a hard -- it's going to be hard to adjust to life. I don't know if Ralph -- I hate to say this, but if Ralph makes it, I sense from this Court, from your Honor, that it would be hard to sentence someone to the rest of their life in prison, and it's not something any of us likes to hear, likes to encounter, but that's the reality that we're facing here with Mr. Garcia's situation.

Ralph, when he got out of prison on the state side -- your Honor is right. He knew where the guns were. Не knew where the drugs were. That was his life. Ralph didn't grow up on the right side of town. Didn't grow up -- more opportunities that I have had, he didn't have those. got out, yes, he knew where the illegal activities took place,

but he also knew how to get a job.

making a pretty good buck. He was able to secure a pretty good job. He got job training. He reached out to people, but I guess that's a two-edge sword reaching out to people.

Given the opportunity, I think Ralph could have and will, if he lives -- if he lives -- set the record straight for

Ralph -- I think the PSR indicates that Ralph was

himself. As Mr. Garcia said to me, and as I tried to articulate to the Court, maybe not as well as Ralph did, but if he just has a chance to get out of state, get away from his circumstances, this wouldn't have happened. Yeah, he would

still know where the people are with the guns. Yeah, he would still know where the people are with the drugs. But he would

have been out of state away from it.

I ask the Court, please, to consider that the 180 months on the 15-year man. min. on Count Four is sufficient, but not greater than necessary in the sentence for Ralph Garcia, and I ask the Court to, of course, give him credit for the time served that Ralph has already put in and I ask that a below-guideline sentence consistent with that be imposed by this Court.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. And, Ms. Kwong, I just want to confirm, by my calculation here it looks like
Mr. Garcia has already been in custody for the last 57 months.

Does that sound right to everybody? From February of 2016?

MR. STURINO: Yes, your Honor. This is Tim Sturino on behalf of the United States.

MR. LEGUTKI: Yes, sir. And John Legutki on behalf of Ralph Garcia. I have -- Tim, I have February 23, 2016.

THE COURT: Okay. So that's almost exactly 57 months already in custody.

Well, thanks, Mr. Legutki, I appreciate it.

Mr. Sturino.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. STURINO: Thank you, your Honor. Just one housekeeping matter I wanted to make clear for the record. Your Honor indicated that you were adopting the guidelines in the PSR, and so I just wanted to make clear that it does not appear that either party has an objection to the guidelines. The guideline range, as calculated by the probation officer was 292 to 327 months. That is based on a Criminal History of VI, and a total offense level of 35 when we do the grouping rules. And so I just wanted to make sure that that was the Court's ruling and the Court's finding at the outset.

THE COURT: Yes. So this is the way I would look at it, Mr. Sturino. I think the defendant did object to the guidelines in terms of acceptance of responsibility, and I'm overruling that objection as a guideline matter, but taketh away with one hand and giveth much of it back with the other hand under 3553(a). And I understood that to be the only

objection, so with that objection being overruled, I will adopt the offense level of 35. Criminal history of VI and all the career offender and grouping calculations, and I think it's 292 to 365 is what I have here. Does that sound right?

MR. STURINO: Excuse me. Yes, you're correct. Yes, the Court is right.

THE COURT: Is that an accurate recitation of the defense position, Mr. Legutki?

MR. LEGUTKI: Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. So I will adopt that guideline, and I think that calculation out to 24 in a full year and a guideline sentence therefore would, you know, Mr. Garcia was -- he's 60 now. So he was 56, I guess, 55 or 56 when he went into custody. 55?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. Let me just -- oh, you just had a birthday about a month ago. So October 19 of -- yes, you're 55, 55 and a half almost when you went in. 24-and-a-third-year sentence would put you just on the verge of 80. And with good time, you would subtract 15 percent of 24 and a third, so that would put you maybe at 77 or something like that; that's pretty old.

MR. LEGUTKI: I'm sorry, sir. We just had an interesting seminar on that, calculation of good time. Mr. Hefler at the Federal Defender's Office gave a very

detailed explanation of that.

2

4

5

7

6

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

it.

20

21

2223

24

25

THE COURT: Yes. Here's the thing, Mr. Legutki. think that stats would tell you that Mr. Garcia at age 55 was unlikely to be committing drug and gun crimes, so it's a little bit of a double-edged sword. But I think there's a big difference between 55, which is what I am right now, and 70 or I mean, I think you fall off the shelf in terms of drug 80. and gun crimes when you hit 70. I have yet to see a 70-year-old who I was sentencing for a drug or gun crime. I have never I've seen fraudsters in his 70s. I just had a guy plead guilty in his early 80s, but he wasn't dealing -- his drug crime was prescription opioids, and he was a doctor. So I guess it's not unheard of, but it's really unlikely at age 70 or 75 or 77. It's a big difference between 55 and 75 in that respect. So -- but I do appreciate everybody helping. Doing all of the math here, so it's not as daunting.

Mr. Sturino, thank you for cinching up the guidelines.
MR. STURINO: And thank you, your Honor. I appreciate

So, your Honor, I'll talk first about the circumstances of the offense a little bit, and I'll talk about Mr. Garcia's criminal history. At the outset, I do acknowledge that the amount of time that Mr. Garcia is facing is extraordinary. That's not lost on the government. It is a lot of time that he is looking at under the guidelines and it's a

lot of time he is looking at under the statute.

I do think, as the Court just calculated, it is all correct. It is all correct under the guidelines and correct legally under the statute. And when I look through Mr. Garcia's PSR, outside of his age, your Honor, I struggle to see the mitigation with respect to his background. I do acknowledge that he's, you know, currently, I believe, 59 years old and that, as your Honor just said, it is unlikely that he would return to a life of crime. The statistics make it fairly unlikely that he would return to a life of crime even after a 15-year sentence. However, as your Honor has pointed out, it was unlikely that he would have committed this crime according to the statistics at the age of 55. And so statistics obviously only tell us so much about what a person will do in the future.

And it's a really hard, almost impossible thing to gauge. And, unfortunately, I don't know Mr. Garcia. I haven't had the opportunity to sit with him or talk to him. So I make my analysis and my future predictions based on what I see in the paper. And that's not entirely fair to Mr. Garcia. I get that. That's why we have defense attorneys and we have prosecutors, but that is where I come from and that's what I see. And I see a person who has the criminal history Mr. Garcia does, and, unfortunately, that drives my recommendation of a guideline sentence.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor, with respect to the circumstances of the offense, I don't wasn't to go back through what happened on those six occasions. Mr. Garcia sold one firearm, as well as 220 grams of methamphetamine to a confidential source. Your Honor sat through the trial and knows the evidence as well as What I want to talk a little bit about was the anyone here. circumstances of those offenses, and other things that Mr. Garcia said that shows that his criminal conduct at that time at the age of 55 was not limited to just these interactions with the source.

And Mr. Legutki said a moment ago that Mr. Garcia knew where the drugs and the guns were, and that is a fair representation. I think it's more than that, though. I think he knew not only where the guns and the drugs were, but I think he had access to the guns and the drugs and he was selling other drugs to other persons at this time.

Your Honor, if you look at the -- if you look at the circumstance of the offense and the recordings between Mr. Garcia and the source -- and a lot of what I'm going to talk about, your Honor, was in the government's reply to the post-trial motions related to pre-disposition. And it shows that when this offense began on November 15th between the source and Mr. Garcia, Mr. Garcia was not a person who was taking orders from the source or was sitting back and waiting for the source to direct him. Mr. Garcia talked about his

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

cocaine sources at the time and that he could get the source cocaine. Mr. Garcia was talking about how he has reliable sources for different types of narcotics. They talked about heroin. They talked about the white or the black or the mud, which refers to different types of heroin.

Mr. Garcia was not shocked or appalled by the source's Instead, it was a lively and engaging conversation questions. that Mr. Garcia fully participated in and offered alternatives to what the source was asking for.

On one occasion, I believe it was November 17th, your Honor, Mr. Garcia even indicated that he had sold narcotics the day before. He said, "I was 'selling the shit,'" a reference to cocaine according to the government, the previous day. That's in the transcript on page 299 to 300.

On another occasion he indicated how he could get eight-balls for \$900. And, in fact, your Honor, it was Mr. Garcia who recommended to the confidential source that he obtain ice -- methamphetamine. It was not the source's idea. And after Mr. Garcia recommended methamphetamine, he then talks about pricing and quality and potency and things like that which shows that he hadn't just learned of it that day. He was in the game, so to speak, and he knew and had access to these items.

And just as an aside, your Honor, I think it's also important that the methamphetamine that Mr. Garcia obtained and

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

sold to the confidential source was pure methamphetamine, 99 percent, if not 100 percent pure, an extremely dangerous It was so dangerous that Mr. Garcia himself would explain to the confidential source how dangerous it was, how (inaudible) it was. He would tell him not to touch it or not to rub his eyes. And he would double baggy the drugs when he provided it to the source. That is the type of narcotic we are talking about that Mr. Garcia was selling to the source, and ostensibly to the source's customers, is the story that the source gave Mr. Garcia.

Your Honor, in addition to what the government contends was other drug trafficking and other access to drugs that Mr. Garcia had, Mr. Garcia and the source also had long conversations about firearms, and a lot of this is in our predisposition session in our reply brief beginning on page 15 of that reply. And I'll highlight a few.

Mr. Garcia talked about how he had gang member friends, P-Stone gang member friends, who had six guns and they could get them. He talked about how they could kidnap someone and obtain that person's guns. He indicated they wouldn't kill the person, but they could kidnap him and take that person's He provided other alternatives. That they could get younger gang members to straw purchase firearms for them, and then they could use the guns for their purpose.

Your Honor, on a few occasions Mr. Garcia indicated

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that he had possession of a firearm at that time, but he was unwilling to give it to the source. For example, your Honor, in the transcript at pages 20 to 22, Mr. Garcia talks about how he had a firearm "over by Mario's." He had forgotten about He explained to the source that he wanted to keep it there just in case he needed it. That's also at transcript 30 to 33, the latter part.

On another occasion, your Honor, Mr. Garcia mentioned to the source that he had a 40 cal. That's in the transcript at pages 255 to 256.

On another occasion, your Honor, the transcript -- it looks like page 152, I believe, the source asks Mr. Garcia if he wanted to get rid of that old Dirty Harry that he was telling him about, and he said, "No. I'm going to hang on to it until I get something else." Of course, Mr. Garcia knew he was a felon. Of course, Mr. Garcia knew he couldn't have these items.

So I think the important point is, you know, contrary to Mr. Garcia's suggestion, it wasn't just the source -- he wasn't just doing this for the confidential source. I don't believe that is accurate. When you look at all of these discussions, and they're lengthy discussions and long transcripts, you see that Mr. Garcia was involved in criminal activity. He had a job as well and he was willing to work. There's no doubt about that, but he was also involved in

criminal activity, deeply involved in criminal activity, and I believe that is reflected in the transcripts, and I would ask

the Court to consider.

the guidelines range.

Your Honor, turning next to Mr. Garcia's criminal history. Mr. Garcia's criminal history, I think, as described by the probation officer, was quite extensive, and I think the seriousness of his criminal history and the extensive nature of his criminal history, including the violent nature of his criminal history, makes it very difficult, at least from my perspective, for the government to recommend a sentence below

Your Honor mentioned that this is one of the more serious criminal histories you've seen. I don't believe I have seen one more serious in 10 years. Mr. Garcia has convictions for attempted armed robbery and that was one case. He stabbed a victim with a knife. Albeit, your Honor, that was in 1979 and he was 19 years old. He then had a conviction for attempted murder. He shot two persons with a handgun, that's in paragraph 77 of the PSR. Again, he's 21 at that point. He then has a conviction for aggravated battery, that's paragraph 78. At this point he is 29. These aren't youthful indiscretions anymore. Frankly, I don't think shooting someone can ever be considered a youthful indiscretion, but regardless, he's growing up, and in that instance he kicks a police officer in the head, and he only got two years for that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Paragraph 80, your Honor, he has another aggravated battery with a firearm conviction. However, the important thing to note there is he's again charged with attempted murder. He essentially has two attempted murder convictions in his background, your Honor. That is something I have never seen.

And, your Honor, he doesn't have that many convictions. He really doesn't. Just about a handful. But he has received serious and long sentences from the Illinois Department of Corrections. Yet when he is paroled in 2012 and then discharged in 2015, he is, again, based on my prior comment, deeply involved in criminal activity again, selling guns and selling pure methamphetamine, as well as obtaining other drugs, or the ability to do so.

So, your Honor, I understand. When Mr. Garcia is released, whenever that is, he is likely not hopefully going to shoot anyone. That's not what I'm saying. He is not going to stab anyone, I hope not, when he's 70 or whatever age he is going to be when he is released, that's not what's going to However, what you see in his criminal history and what you see in this offense is he adapted. He was dangerous when he was 20, there's no doubt about it. He was dangerous when he was 55. He just changed a little. He just adapted to the time. Selling pure methamphetamine, putting firearms on the street in the hands of other gang members is dangerous.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I don't know what he'll do at 70, hopefully he will be done. But, again, as I started, your Honor, I have these papers as a guide for me, and I don't see, absent his age -and those statistics were wrong with Mr. Garcia the first time. I don't see a whole lot of mitigation. And I don't enjoy saying that, your Honor, but unfortunately it's what I see in his background. It's a violent background and an extensive background, and I think it justifies a lengthy sentence.

Your Honor, I don't have anything else. I can address the objections for supervised release conditions. A few, I agree with Mr. Legutki; one or two, I would I disagree with, but we can do that now or at the end.

THE COURT: Why don't I let Mr. Legutki finish his 3553(a) presentation, and then let Mr. Garcia offer any comments he would like, and then we'll go over the terms of supervision if that's okay.

So, Mr. Legutki, any further rebuttal?

MR. LEGUTKI: Yes, thank you, your Honor. Thank you, Mr. Sturino. I think when the government looks back in time and it sees what cannot be changed -- even God can't change the But what the government does is improperly enhance that, it discusses and suggests a lot of uncharged, unproven conduct that is -- I don't think makes it into the allegation phase, so I think that's inappropriate.

Yes, Mr. Garcia grew up in a different world than I

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

think all of us have grown up in or have experienced. And I guess we can read a rap sheet and if we live in the world where there is violence, if we live in the world where there are drugs, I have a feeling that we are no -- we would know where the violence is, we would know where those guns are, we would know where the drugs are.

The government stresses about the purity of the meth, and I don't think there's any allegation -- there wasn't even allegation that Mr. Garcia was the manufacturer of this. He gets -- he gets it where he gets it. It is wrong to have it. It is wrong to sell it. It is illegal. But Mr. Garcia was not the manufacturer.

You know, it's not like you go to the 7-11 and say, "I'll have 100 percent pure meth or 50 percent pure methamphetamine." That's what's available on the street.

As far as 3553 factors, your Honor, I would stress that we have -- the Court needs to formulate a sentence that's sufficient but not greater than necessary. I think we're all understanding that Mr. Garcia gets out when he's 70-something years old, the likelihood of recidivism, the likelihood of being involved in this kind of conduct greatly diminishes. The government says they don't see any mitigation to that.

Your Honor, I think age, in and of itself, is a mitigating factor in Mr. Garcia's situation. There were glimmers of Mr. Garcia's willingness to get a real job, try to

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

avoid going back to jail. Your Honor heard all of the evidence regarding -- during trial regarding the issue of entrapment, and took all of the factors that the government just read off into consideration in rendering his verdict, but I think that's water under the bridge, your Honor.

What we're looking at now is sentencing, and I think Mr. Garcia's sentence, 180 months, which is 15 years, and I'm looking at a chart that was just given to us a few days ago, that would come out to be 810 days of good time, and the actual time served would be 12 years, nine months, and 11 days, according to Mr. Hepler's chart that was just provided to us at the recent seminar at the Federal Defender. So I, again, ask this Court for a below-guideline sentence for Mr. Garcia, no greater than the 180 months, 15 years as to Count Four, and any sentences with the remaining count to run concurrent with Count No. Four.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you for all of your arguments, and thanks to both counsel.

So, Mr. Garcia, at sentencing a defendant has an opportunity to say anything you would like. I did get your letter last night, which I do appreciate. If there's anything else you would like to say, though, you are welcome to do so at this time, sir.

THE DEFENDANT: The only thing I would say, your Honor is that in the beginning I really tried hard. It's not until I

got some more hurdles, which made it I didn't know where to go, so I went back to the people that always helped me before and that's how I found myself in this situation. You know, a lot of those things we talked about, a lot of those discussions we had were just that, discussions. Nothing. Especially when I started to realize that he wanted me to do it. He didn't want to do it. He wanted me to do it. So that's how -- there's no way I can prove none of this or anything, but that's the way it goes.

And thank you for everything you have done and thank you, Mr. Sturino, for leaving me out there as long as you did.

> THE COURT: Okav.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Is that all you wanted to say, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Thanks, Mr. Garcia. Thank you for your letter and the letters from your family members. I really appreciate getting those, too.

MR. LEGUTKI: Your Honor, if I can just add one more Because of the newness of the situation, does the record have to be made that everyone agrees to have this by video under the CARES Act?

THE COURT: Yeah, we should do that orally, too, and I will just confirm that it has been put on there. You guys did send me the order. There is an order that I signed last week that has written consent to proceeding under the CARES Act, but

we might as well orally confirm that as well.

So, Mr. Garcia, I probably should have started out today by asking you this, but you probably know about the order we've entered. You have no problem proceeding by video today. sir?

> THE DEFENDANT: No, no. Not at all.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Legutki, for reminding me of that. And it just gave me the opportunity to check and make sure that we have put the signed order on the docket, which we have, so we're good to go here.

In terms of the conditions of supervised release, I would like to go over those now because there were a few objections and I want to make sure that you all end up with --

(Phone ringing.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So it looks to me, Mr. Legutki, like you guys had objection to a couple of the discretionary conditions and a couple of the special conditions, but no objections to the mandatory conditions; is that right?

MR. LEGUTKI: No, your Honor. The mandatory, as far as I know, are mandatory.

THE COURT: Thanks. Okay. Well, let me go over the mandatory conditions, then, with Mr. Garcia. Mr. Garcia, if there's any questions you have about any of the conditions we're going to go over, if you ask me now, I can try to explain

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I'm going to end up giving you in terms of them. supervised release the statutory mandatory minimum amount of So it ends up being five years of supervised release time. because that's the minimum on Counts Two, Three, and Five. There's a four-year minimum on Counts One and Six and a three-year minimum on Count Four, but if I impose them all concurrently, it ends up being five years of supervised release. So you will have to adhere to these conditions after the first five years after you're released. I would consider terminating them early if it turns out that you are in complete compliance for the first half of that period. Mr. Garcia?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. So here are the mandatory Number 1 is you shall not commit another federal, conditions. state, or local crime; that's pretty self-explanatory. Number 2 is you shall not unlawfully possess a controlled Number 6 is you shall cooperate in the collection substance. of a DNA sample, if the collection of such a sample is required And No. 6 is a drug-testing condition that says you bv law. shall refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance, and submit to one drug test within 15 days of release. then at least two periodic tests thereafter up to 104 periodic tests for use of controlled substance during each year of supervised release. So a maximum of two tests a week, and the

probation officer will coordinate that with you. All of that clear, Mr. Garcia?

3

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

5

4

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okav. Great. Let's move on to the discretionary conditions, then. Number 4 is you shall speak and work conscientiously at lawful employment, or if you're not gainfully employed, you should pursue conscientiously a course of study or vocational training that will equip you for employment. That makes sense no matter what your age is, because you're going to have to support yourself, but I don't expect that you're going to, like, go back to college or something like that. You might end up doing a truck-driving course, though. And if you did that, the probation officer might be able to help hook you up with that and maybe even pay for it if that's something you're interested in. And just know that this time around there will be a lot more flexibility than last time in terms of things you might want to do that would require travel outside of the district, as long as you're in compliance with all of these terms. Okay, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Number 6 is one to which there was an objection here. And, Mr. Sturino, I will ask you your views on that.

MR. STURINO: Your Honor, our position is that No. 6 should be imposed. I think if you hear from Mr. Garcia, he

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

indicated that, you know, when he got out in 2015, he tried to do it the right way. He got a job. He attempted to stay away, and at a certain point, he couldn't. And when I say stay away, I mean stay away from the Latin Kings. And when he got back involved with the Latin Kings, when he associated with the confidential source and others, all of a sudden he was -- had access to dealing the drugs and firearms. And so I think this is a relatively innocuous condition, but I do think it is important especially for a gang case and for a defendant who has had life-long membership in a gang.

Okay. Mr. Legutki, anything else you THE COURT: wanted to say beyond what you said in the memo?

MR. LEGUTKI: Your Honor, when you go back to the neighborhood that you grow up in -- he grew up in and people are in gangs, what do you do? I mean, if you're surrounded by this, you're in this environment, how can you not help but communicate with these people? I think one of the mandatory conditions was not to engage in criminal activity. that does it. If you're put in a neighborhood environment you grew up in you know all of these people and they are in gangs and Latin Kings in these neighborhoods or GDs or whatever but that's the only people around, how is this practical?

THE COURT: Well, I think it requires a practical construction by the judge. And I have had this come up in other cases that are pretty similar to Mr. Garcia's. And what

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I would say to that is, look, if you have family members who are in this type of activity, there's a difference between going to Thanksgiving at your mother's house where you're communicating with people about the turkey dinner and the Bears game and the kind of conversations that were recorded and played at the trial. And I do think that this is the kind of thing that should give someone like Mr. Garcia an added incentive to actually stay away from people who he knows he shouldn't be associating with them. And he said himself, "I tried really hard. And for a while I was doing it. And then I went back to all of the people who had helped me before." And all of that help that he's gotten before has left him in IDOC for about 25 years of his life. That's not the kind of help he should be looking for.

So I am going to impose it, but I want you to understand, Mr. Garcia, I have a practical construction and it's what I just said. If you end up at your mother's house or a relative's house and there happen to be people who are gang members there, you know, I can't choose your family for you. And I can't control all of the other people in your family either, or your friends, for that matter.

What this is really the idea is when someone asks you to reassociate with criminal activity, and you know that's what they're doing, this is another reason to say no. Because not only is it a violation if you get caught, you could get charged

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

again, but you also would be in violation of the terms of your supervision, so you have to refrain from -- and, again, listen to the word "knowingly," any person who you know to be engaged in criminal activity. If you know they want to sell guns or drugs, that should be like kryptonite for you. You should get away as fast as you can, because you don't want to spend any more time than you have to in prison. And I'm cognizant of I'm cognizant of the glimmers of hope that vour age. Mr. Legutki was averring to, but I do think you really have to make the effort, and you have to make it stick this time.

I believe you when you say you were looking for legitimate work. There's pay stubs and there's reports of salary -- and it looks like you were making about 50 grand, which isn't so bad for somebody with no dependents; that's pretty good. That's where we want you to be on your way out. And just know this time, too, that we work with people. The federal system has resources. We work with people, so please let us help you help yourself. Okay?

Number 7, I agree with Mr. Legutki. I suspect Okay. you do, too, Mr. Sturino, that no alcohol is an imposition that we don't need to have here, and so instead we'll change it to no excessive use of alcohol. Is the government comfortable with that?

> MR. STURINO: I am, your Honor. I agree with that. THE COURT: Okay. So No. 7 is going to say you shall

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

refrain from any excessive use of alcohol, defined as a blood alcohol concentration greater than .08. And from any use of a narcotic drug or other controlled substance, as defined in Section 102 of the Controlled Substances Act, which is a federal law, without a prescription by a licensed medical practitioner. So that just means you've got to -- used in moderation, okay, Mr. Garcia?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Most people by the time they get to your age and my age are trying to get moderation. It's the bar fights when you're 22 that we're worried about. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Thank you.

THE COURT: Number 8, you know about. You shall not possess a firearm, destructive device, or other dangerous weapon.

Number 9 is you shall participate at the direction of a probation officer in a substance abuse treatment program, which may include urine testing, up to a maximum of 104 tests per year. And that's really just a way to give you some better coping mechanisms and to make sure you don't get yourself back into trouble. Okay, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Then 14 through 18 are all of the conditions that allow the probation officer to do his or her job.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So 14 is you shall not knowingly leave from the federal judicial district where you're being supervised, unless granted permission to leave by the Court or a probation officer. And then it says that the geographic area of our district, which is the Northern District of Illinois, currently consists of the Illinois counties of Cook, DuPage, Grundy, Kane, Kendall, Lake, LaSalle, Will, Boone, Carroll, Dekalb, Jo Davies, Lee, McHenry, Ogle, Stephenson, Whiteside, and Winnebago Counties.

Now, as I said before, if you come to me with a job you want to drive a truck or if you want to go all of the way from New York to California and back, if you're in compliance with all of these terms, and it's a legitimate company that pays you legitimate good money, we're very open to that. I would encourage you to think about that since it's something you've been interested in before. So think about that, but just know that you have to ask. But we're pretty liberal about giving you permission as long as you ask and you're in compliance with everything. Okay, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. 15 is you have to report to the probation office in the Federal Judicial District to which you're released from imprisonment, and you have to report to the probation officer at reasonable times as directed by the Court or the probation officer. That's just so they can check

in on you, see how you're doing. They might ask you for a paystub or a letter of employment, how's everything going, that kind of stuff, okay?

> THE DEFENDANT: All right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. Number 16. I have sort of a practice of checking only a few boxes here. I think Ms. Kwong knows that from all of our other cases. So we are going to check here, "You shall permit a probation officer to visit you at any reasonable time," and we'll just leave the "at work or other reasonable locations specified by a probation officer," The rest of them are really backups. And if that checked. turns out to be the best place to visit, it is covered by other locations. But generally speaking, home is the best place, or you could meet at the Starbucks or the McDonald's, or whatever, that's pretty -- but this gives the maximum flexibility without directing anybody necessarily to your school or your work or something like that. Okay? And we are going to permit the probation officer to confiscate any contraband observed in plain view. Okay, Mr. Garcia?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. And then you have to notify the probation officer within 72 hours after becoming aware of any change in residence, employer, or workplace. And absent a constitutional or other legal privilege, you have to answer any questions from the probation officer. And you have to answer

truthfully any questions unless you have a constitutional or other legal privilege. Okay, sir?

> THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And then the last one is you have to notify the probation officer within 72 hours after being arrested, charged with a crime, or questioned by law enforcement. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. And then we're on to -- so we have 23 here, and that's a search condition here. Any comments on that, Mr. Legutki?

MR. LEGUTKI: Number 3 of the special conditions, your Honor?

THE COURT: 23 of the discretionary conditions.

MR. LEGUTKI: No, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. So, Mr. Garcia, No. 23 is you have to submit your person, property, house, residence, or vehicle, or papers or computers to a search conducted by the U.S. Probation Officer. Failure to submit to a search may be grounds for revocation of release. You should warn other occupants that the premises may be subject to searches pursuant to this condition. And an officer may conduct a search pursuant to this condition only when reasonable suspicion exists that the defendant has violated a condition of his supervision, and the area to be searched contains evidence of

this violation, and any search must be conducted at a reasonable time in a reasonable manner.

3 4

5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22 23

24

25

So if they get wind that you might be involved in either narcotics or gun activities, they're going to have permission to search your house during this time. Okay?

MR. STURINO: And, your Honor -- I'm sorry to interrupt. And, your Honor, I just wanted to add to that condition. I think there's a factual basis to support it as These transactions occurred in the driveway of Mr. Garcia's home. Mr. Garcia would exit his home and enter a vehicle, and then do the deals with the source there, so I do think there's a factual basis to support this condition.

THE COURT: I appreciate your making a record on that, and that's what I assumed that you were going to say, and the reason I think Mr. McKechnie put this condition in the first It's the same thing as some of these other conditions. place. It's just an extra incentive and motivation for Mr. Garcia to do what he says he want to do, which is to stay out of this and keep himself out of prison. Because at this point, Mr. Garcia, I hope this is the last time you're ever in -- under a sentence, because if there's another one after this, it's almost certainly going to be a life sentence, and we don't want that for you. Okay?

MR. LEGUTKI: Your Honor, excuse me, Mr. Sturino, your Honor, to me the critical issue was the reasonableness of this.

Mr. Garcia has had difficulties in the past with the probation/state parole. The whole reasonableness needs to be expressed in that, and I think that's covered by your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes, I agree with that exactly,

Mr. Legutki. You know, I don't know the experience of

probation in the state system, but I do know, because our

probation officers -- I always say they're out doing the Lord's

work because it's hard when you come out of prison. And you

know this, Mr. Garcia. It's hard to make the transition. And

nothing makes me happier than someone successfully completing

their probation. I tell people all of the time when I have

them in on probation issues. I always say, "Look, I hope that

I only see you one time again, and it's when you finish your

probation. I hope you walk through my courtroom doors and sit

through my call, and at the end of the call I get to shake your

hand," because that's what we want. We want you to succeed,

and we work very hard for people to succeed.

And we give second chances and third chances because we know it's hard. It's a lot harder to give a second and a third chance when you do something really seriously wrong, but, you know, there are people who are on electronic monitoring and they don't -- they struggle with it at first because they don't realize their back porch is outside the monitor. We don't revoke people for that. We work with them. We have people who have had substance abuse problems their whole life. If they

2

3

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

fall off the wagon once, we work with them. We don't revoke We want you to succeed. So that's my goal there. probation officers aren't out to harass you, they're out to help you.

And I'm confident that you will have a better experience in federal probation than you had before, because we want to work with you, okay, and that just reinforces Mr. Legutki's point, which is, they're only going to search if it's reasonable to do so and that's if they have a real suspicion that you're falling off the wagon so to speak. 0kay?

> THE DEFENDANT: Okav.

THE COURT: The third condition and the second condition, Mr. Sturino, what do you think of that one?

MR. STURINO: Your Honor, this is the one about community service, 20 hours of community service.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. STURINO: Your Honor, I do sympathize with Mr. Legutki's objection. My position would be that this could be something that we can revisit when Mr. Garcia is released. The concern, I think, is, you know, if a person does not otherwise have employment and otherwise keeping himself busy, bad things happen. I think that's the point of 20 hours of community service. But if Mr. Garcia is not in good health or not physically able to do community service, then I would fully agree that he should not be doing so. I don't have a strong

position, your Honor, but I guess my feeling is this is something that can be revisited when he is released from custody.

14 15

17

18

16

19 20

22

21

23 24

25

THE COURT: Okav. Let me tell you my case on this one, which is really sometimes it is an opportunity for people because an internship, if people like you it can lead to a paying job or volunteer work, but I think Mr. Garcia's at least going to be 70 no matter what happens here, and so I'm inclined to think it's unlikely that we would ever put him into community service, but it may depend on the circumstances, if there's, you know, an opportunity to volunteer somewhere that may turn into a paying job. I just don't know. I am verv sympathetic to your point which is once you're past the retirement age, pressing you into service is a hard thing to But if he doesn't have any other way to support himself, there's going to have to be something to move him in that direction. So I don't feel strongly about it either.

Any further thoughts you have, Mr. Legutki?

MR. LEGUTKI: Yes, your Honor. I am older than all of you, and at 63, if someone told me I had to do 20 hours of community service, it would be a burden. I mean, it's different in your 50s and your 40s. And I hope I will still be complaining about these things when I'm 70, but I think it makes a big difference, your Honor. I think there's a time value in this that cannot be quantified, but yet needs to be

recognized. We don't know who the probation officer is going to be at that time. Your Honor, I hope you're still on the bench making great rulings at the end of the time, but we don't know. I would hate to have this be a catchall, oh, let's trip him up anyhow. Not that you would do it or the current probation officer would do it. I'm just trying to think ahead. I just don't think this is a reasonable condition to impose on Mr. Garcia when he gets out.

THE COURT: Okay. You win.

Discretionary Condition No. 4 is already there. It requires him to seek employment. You know, I don't know what the circumstances are going to be. But I'm not going to -- I don't feel strongly about it mostly because of the realities of this situation, and I do think it's unlikely that it would ever come into play. If I'm still around on the bench at this time, we'll see. I don't know. When I turn 65, it's going to be awfully tempting to go do something else where I could get paid 10 or 20 times what I get paid right here.

MR. LEGUTKI: I've got my application in for that job.

THE COURT: I left it 13 years ago. So my wife always reminds me that between the age of 42 and 55 I've minimized my income potential by about \$40 million, but that's okay.

We'll waive that one. I'll use No. 4 if I'm still making all of the good rulings you're hoping for to make sure that Mr. Garcia is doing the best he can in the circumstances.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we'll leave No. 3 out, Kelly, and we'll move on to the next one, which is -- it's the one about the credit charges.

Now -- here, I'll give you a preview of coming attractions here. The only financial penalty in this case is going to be the \$600 special assessment. There will be no fine. The potential fine in this case is a staggering amount But Mr. Garcia doesn't have the wherewithal to pay of monev. any fine at all. So we're only talking about \$600 here, and it's going to be imposed at 10 percent of net monthly income. So it makes it almost impossible for Mr. Garcia not to be in compliance. We're only going to shave off a few bucks a month. And in the space of a year, if he has any job at all, he'll be able to pay off the \$600.

PROBATION OFFICER: Excuse me, your Honor. I'm sorry for interrupting.

There -- I think there's an issue of buy money.

THE COURT: Oh, there is buy money. Oh, okay. I missed that. Thank you for reminding me.

PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, that's Special Condition No. 12.

THE COURT: There it is. \$7,600. So, \$8,200. Well. that's more money, but, you know, I've had restitution where it's been millions of dollars in restitution owed for some massive fraud. So even at \$7,600 at 10 percent of your net monthly income, it's not going to be an impossible thing to pay

off over time. We're only going to take 10 percent of your net monthly income. And so as long as you're letting the government take 10 percent of your net monthly income, you'll be in compliance with the financial conditions imposed by the judgment, in which case you can incur new credit charges. So I don't think there's too much to object to in No. 5 here because the reality is it's not very hard to stay in compliance, whatever it would be, 20 bucks, 40 bucks a month, is a small amount. So I'm going to overrule the objection to No. 5 just to make sure.

The problem I have sometimes is people blow off the restitution, and that's not right. I have no reason to think you're going to do that, Mr. Garcia, because you want to be in compliance. We're not asking much here. And if you're in compliance, we might even let you go early from these conditions. So it's a small price to pay to perhaps get your full freedom back sooner. So No. 5 is you shall not incur new credit charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer, unless you are in compliance with the financial obligations imposed by the judgment. And those obligations will be \$600 special assessment and the \$7,600 in buy money. We're talking about \$8,200 total.

Number 6 is you shall provide the probation officer access to any requested financial information necessary to monitor compliance with the conditions of supervision. That's

probably a pay stub or a letter from your employer or a tax

Some way that they know what you're making so they can

Okay, sir? collect that 10 percent.

4

3

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. And then we're down to No. 10, which is the 10 percent. So you have to pay to the clerk of the court any financial obligation ordered that remains unpaid at the commencement of the term of supervised release, at a rate of not less than 10 percent of the total of your gross earnings, minus federal and state income tax withholding, so once your employer takes your taxes out, whatever that gross number is that's left, 10 percent of that goes to the

government until you pay of the 8200. Okay, Mr. Garcia?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Number 11, you shall not enter into any agreement to act as an informer or special agent of law enforcement without the permission of the Court. So if anybody approaches you about that, you have to come and talk to me about that first. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: Okay. And the last one is you have to pay to the Clerk of the Court \$7600 as repayment for the government funds you received during the investigation, and those funds will be remitted to the ATF, which I believe is the government agency that advanced those funds listed here in the PSR. 0kay,

1 Mr. Garcia?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. Five years on that, and if you're doing well after two and a half, come and ask me to let you go for the other two and a half, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: Okay. So I've got to make my statement now and go through the 3553(a) factors, so if you'll bear with me for a few minutes.

I think it was April 3rd of 2020 that I entered the order finding the defendant guilty on all six counts in this case. There were five narcotics counts and Count Four is the gun count, and that's all laid out in the PSR. And then so I asked for the PSR to be prepared to help with sentencing. And as I have already done the guideline findings for you guys, but my recollection is that the total offense level is 35, a Criminal History of VI. That results in an advisory guideline range of 292 to 365 months.

The statutory max for Counts Two through Five is life. For Counts One and Six, it's 40 years. The mandatory minimum for Count Four is 15 years. Counts Two, Three, and Five is 10 years. Counts One and Six is 5 years. Fortunately for Mr. Garcia, those do not stack on top of each other because that's a lot of mandatory sentences. So it's 15 years is the mandatory minimum in this case.

The supervised release on all but the gun count, the statutory max is life. I have already gone through the minimums and the guidelines for that, so I'm pretty much tied by the minimums to give a five-year period of supervised release, with all of the periods running concurrently. The fine, as I said before, is astronomical. Counts Two, Three, and Five contain a maximum fine of 10 million. Counts One and Six is 5,000,000. Count Four, it's only 250,000.

The guideline for the fine is between 20,000 and 10,000,000. For the reasons I previously stated, there will be no fine. The special assessment of \$600, which is a hundred dollars a count, is mandatory, and you add that to the buy money and that's where we get the 8200.

My job as a sentencing judge is to impose a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary to serve all of the Section 3553(a) purposes. So I would like to make a few comments for the record about how I see those factors applying in this case.

We start out with the nature and circumstances of the offense. As Mr. Sturino pointed out, trafficking in firearms and very potent narcotics is a very dangerous thing for the community. These drugs are so potent, they had to be double-bagged with special instructions for handling. And, you know, obviously, if you buy this stuff, you're trusting the person who's distributing it to give you something that isn't

2

3 4

5

6

7 8

9 10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24 25 going to kill you, and that doesn't always happen. People also get addicted. It creates a lot of bad secondary effects in the community, and that's why it's illegal. It is a serious offense.

And when we go to the history and characteristics of the defendant. So I'm going to start with the bad and turn to the good here. 0kay?

The bad, it's a bad criminal history. There's a lot of violence. There's people being shot. I understand from Mr. Garcia's PSR, and also from his mother's letter, that he was a gunshot victim as well and it was very serious. And he barely made it, according to his mother's letter. You know, that's a very difficult life, and a lot of people don't make it living that life, and Mr. Garcia was pretty close to being one of those people who didn't make it. So it's a serious record.

And Mr. Sturino pointed out there's not a lot of crimes in number here. I've seen much longer records in that respect, but there was one sentence of 40 years, in which he served 20. Well, if you're going to be in IDOC for 20 years, it's going to take you out of commission to commit further crimes.

You know, the unfortunate piece here, really, is that those glimmers of hope that Mr. Legutki referred to and that Mr. Garcia's referred to and that his mother gave in great detail in her letter didn't stick. That's the problem here is

that there was a chance when Mr. Garcia was in his early 50s to turn this around after he was paroled in 2012. There is a history of some gainful employment. I can't say that for all of my armed career offenders, so that is a positive. But, you know, the tapes I listened to at the trial actually are concerning in the sense that there wasn't a lot of resistance there. There was a great detail of knowledge about where you can get drugs and where you can get guns in the community, of great variety that was being offered for sale. That's concerning.

And that leads me to the other 3553(a) factors. Just punishment and deterrence, and those are troubling, too, because if 20 years in IDOC doesn't deter you, I'm not sure what could. People don't like IDOC. If you had a choice between IDOC and federal, you would take federal every time. IDOC is harder time. So that's all concerning to me.

I am cognizant of Mr. Garcia's age, and I do think that that is a factor that I can take into account that will reduce his sentence. I have to look at unwarranted sentencing disparities, and this is something that Mr. Sturino averted to as well. If Mr. Garcia had toted up this record by age 35, and some people do, it would be an argument for a longer sentence, not a shorter sentence because somebody who's engaged in that level of crime and that level of violent crime may be somebody who needs to be taken out of society for a legitimate guideline

sentence here, like 25 years. That's the guideline sentence here, 24 and a third years.

3 4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

24 25

I think Mr. Garcia's age actually cuts against that in this circumstance, because he's -- you know, he's 60 now. turned 60 a month ago. And so I think that's a factor that I will take into account, and take that into account in his favor.

The other things I would say in his favor, really, are those glimmers, and the idea that he can do this. I think you're going to have to resist the lure to go back to, as you've said, people who have helped you out before, because they really haven't helped you out in a way that has netted you out very well. I mean, you've spent way too much time of your life in prison. And the sentence in this case is just going to increase the percentage of your life that you spend in prison. But I can't see giving you a guideline sentence here, even though but for your age and those glimmers of hope, it would be completely justifiable to give you a guideline sentence here because this record is a really disturbing record with a lot of violence and people getting shot. That's really dangerous and scary.

But, you know, Mr. Garcia, I know you have got it in I know you do. You just have to work with us on the vou. other end of the sentence. But I can't blind my eye to everything that Mr. Sturino said as well about the record.

There's only so much of a break I can give you for your age and those glimmers of hope. And for my own -- I don't know you any better than Mr. Sturino does, except that you've been coming in my courtroom for five years, and this is where I'm going to give you credit for acceptance of responsibility, too.

You wanted to go to trial to test a legal question. But you admitted to all of the conduct, and the question was is there a legal defense to this conduct. I give you credit for that. You could have made this a lot more difficult for the government. In the end would they have convicted you, yeah, I think they would have convicted you, but you could have made this a lot more difficult. You know, I have hope for your future, Mr. Garcia, if you work with us. You have got to work with us. You have to take advantage of what we're going to offer you, which is a probation officer who will actually check in on you and be positive with you, and try to get you on the right path. And if you need help finding employment, if you need flexibility, as you said before, if it turns out what you really want to do is drive a truck across the state lines, we'll work with you on that. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: So, Mr. Legutki, have I addressed all of your principal arguments?

MR. LEGUTKI: Yes, sir, you have. Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Sturino, have I addressed all of your

principal arguments as well?

. .

MR. STURINO: Yes, your Honor. I have nothing else.

THE COURT: Okay. Very good. So the question in this case really comes down to how much of a discount can I give you off of the guidelines and still give you a sentence that is sufficient but not greater than necessary. And in my judgment, and pursuant to the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, the sentence is going to be 210 months, which is 82 months off the low end of the guidelines, but still a little bit above the mandatory minimum, and that will be on Count Four, concurrent with all of the other counts. So it's one sentence of 210 months. Five years of supervised release, basically giving you the mandatory minimum on all of the counts for supervised release, and the minimum financial imposition I can give you as well.

And so the only other thing I know that I have to cover is two things. One is, Mr. Legutki, if you all have a recommendation for a facility, I would be happy to recommend that.

MR. LEGUTKI: Your Honor, somewhere -- Mr. Garcia, as evidenced by his letters submitted by his mom, family members and significant other, closest and nearest Chicago -- excuse me -- as close to Chicago as possible would be the request.

THE COURT: Do you want me to recommend the RDAP? He may be ineligible based on the conviction, but do you want me to recommend it anyway?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LEGUTKI: Well, your Honor, that was in my notes, actually. Given the fact that there is drug and alcohol counseling that is part of supervised release conditions that was talked about extensively during the sentencing. I would ask that RDAP be recommended by this Court.

THE COURT: Okay. And I'll be happy to do that. Mr. Garcia, I'm going to recommend you for the Residential Drug Abuse Program. If they'll let you in it and you complete it successfully, you can get out sooner. It will give you a reduction in your sentence. And I think it might help you. I read your mom's letter and that's really what triggered in my mind to suggest this, because I think your mom feels confident that you can stay sober, and if you do, it will enhance the likelihood that you'll be able to be successful. So are you okay with that, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Okay. So I will put the facility closest to Chicago that offers the RDAP.

And, then, Mr. Garcia, I have to advise you that if you want to appeal either the conviction or the sentence, you would have to do that within 14 days of the date the judgment and conviction order appears on the docket. That probably won't be until next week because every time I give a sentence that's below the guidelines, I have to write up a statement of reasons for why I did that. So it's going to take me a couple

of days for me to get that typed up and sent off to Carolyn because we're not coming to the office these days. have 14 days from that date to file a Notice of Appeal if you wish to do so. Okay, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LEGUTKI: Your Honor, if I might ask, just from personal experience, when the J&C is issued, sometimes it is backdated to today. I've had this experience before over the years. Let's say it comes out in a week, it's backdated to today. If it's just dated the day it comes out, it would be helpful.

THE COURT: Yes. We certainly will date it from the day it comes out, especially because of the Thanksgiving holiday, and you need to have a chance to consult with Mr. Garcia on whether he wishes to appeal. So we'll make sure we put the date that it's actually on the docket, and then you will get an electronic notice of that, okay?

MR. LEGUTKI: Just one less headache to deal with, Judge.

THE COURT: Yes, I agree. I know how that can happen because sometimes the judges aren't careful about not signing the right date on it because they know the date that they sentenced, but they don't know the date it's being processed, but we'll make sure we are careful about that.

MR. LEGUTKI: Thank you, sir.